(*c*) the reason, if there should be difference, in the numbers of deeds so registered ;

(*d*) whether there is any change in the values of immovable properties before and after the coming of the Act into force ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT (Rajasevaprasakta A. N. Raghavachar).**—

	Mortgage Deeds.		*Sale Deeds*	
Year.	*No.*	*Value.*	*No.*	*Value.*
		Rs.		Rs.
(*a*) 1935-36	55,479	1,39,26,300	75,308	1,74,24,921
1936-37	57,767	1,37,86,056	83,332	1,85,87,437
(*b*) 1939-40	58,576	1,32,25,863	87,880	1,97,31,913
1940-41	46 378	1,27,97,051	91,055	2,14,94,442

(*c*) It would be difficult to state this definitely.

(*d*) Information is not readily available.

Shandy Income of Anavatti Village, Shimoga District.

Q.—61. **Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.** (Sorab—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) since how long the Shimoga District Board have been auctioning the right of holding shandy in Anavatti and what is the income that the District Board have been deriving annually therefrom ;

(*b*) how much have they spent for providing facilities for holding the shandy and in respect of what items ;

(*c*) when did the Government order the payment by the District Board to the Anavatti Village Panchayat of one-fourth of the income from the shandy ;

(*d*) for how many years past the village panchayat has been paid the amount and what is the amount so paid ;

(*e*) whether the District Board have communicated any orders to the village panchayat to the effect that they would adjust the amount payable by them to the village panchayat to the one-third share of the charges on account of menial establishment of the maternity ward at Anavatti payable by the village panchayat to the District Board ;

(*f*) if so, whether they have at all provided any menial establishment for service in the maternity ward ;

(*g*) if not, how many years' dues to the village panchayat have been retained by the District Board ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. V. Narayana Rao).**—

(*a*) Since the date of the abolition of the Taluk Board, the District Board have been auctioning the right. The income is detailed hereunder :—

		Rs.
1927-28	...	950
1928-29	..	915
1929-30	...	955
1930-31	...	960
1931-32	...	700
1932-33	...	940
1933-34	...	1,000
1934-35	...	825
1935-36	...	875
1936-37	...	916
1937-38	...	800
1938-39	...	805
1939-40	...	990
1940-41	...	895

(*b*) A sum of Rs. 1,993 has been spent towards the construction of market stalls.

(*c*) During the year 1935-36.

(*d*) From the year of Government order up-to-date, an aggregate sum of Rs. 1,118 has been paid by adjustment towards the well contribution as agreed to by the village panchayat on 8-12-1935 and approved by the Deputy Commissioner and towards contribution to the maternity home and a sum of Rs. 105-0-8 by cheque for credit to the village panchayat funds.

(*e*) The transactions in this respect have been intimated to the Amildar of

the taluk who is the chief controlling authority of the panchayats.

(*f*) Proposals for the special establishment have been sent up to the Senior Surgeon for obtaining sanction of Government.

(*g*) No dues are retained by the Board.

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—When were the market stalls constructed?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—How many stalls have been built?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Notice.

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—For what purpose were they constructed?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—For holding the shandy.

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—But are the stalls being made use of for that purpose?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Obviously.

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—Is any rent being levied on the stalls?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—I presume so.

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—Up to what date has the shandy income due to the village panchayat by the District Board been adjusted and how much amount has been debited towards the contribution due by the panchayat to the District Board on account of the maternity establishment?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Please see answer to (*d*).

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—The exact amount of contribution towards the materinity establishment has not been stated in the answer.

The MINISTER for LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT and PUBLIC HEALTH (Mr. H. B. Gundappa Gowda).—The village panchayat had agreed to contribute towards the charges of the establishment of the maternity home. The District Board must have adjusted out of the shandy income whatever amount was due.

Mr. MALLIKARJUNAPPA GOWDA.—Why should the panchayat pay anything when it is not deriving any benefit from the maternity home? Is there a maternity establishment at all?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—I presume that in anticipation of sanctioning a maternity establishment, they might be adjusting the amount. But, no definite information on the point is readily available.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Will the Government be pleased to see for what purpose the amount is being adjusted?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Yes.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Will it be in order to go on adjusting amounts in anticipation of providing an establishment?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—No answer.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH.—Are all District Boards paying one-fourth of the income from shandies to the concerned village panchayats?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Conditions vary with each district. Some get more and some get less.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH.—If I make a statement here that some village panchayats are not at all getting any portion of the shandy income, will the matter be kindly enquired into?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—If the panchayat concerned complains, the matter will be enquired into.

Mr. GURUNATHA KRISHNA NADIGAR.—Why should not the District Board furnish the details to the concerned village panchayat direct?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—The resolutions of the panchayat go through the concerned Amildar, he being the chief controlling authority over it. Hence the District Board cannot communicate with the panchayats direct.

Mr. GURUNATHA KRISHNA NADIGAR.—At least on urgent questions, why should not direct correspondence between the District Board and the panchayat be permitted?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—The suggestion will be considered.

Mr. GURUNATHA KRISHNA NADIGAR.—With reference to (*f*), has the special establishment since been sanctioned?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Not yet.

Mr. GURUNATHA KRISHNA NADIGAR.—How long have the proposals been pending sanction?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—Notice.

Mr. GURUNATHA KRISHNA NADIGAR.—Could it be that, because the establishment has not yet been sanctioned, the District Board is keeping, in *amanath*, the share of the shandy income payable by them to the panchayat?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—The District Board is not keeping any money with it in *amanath*. All the income realised from shandy is remitted to the taluk treasury for being kept in *amanath* to be spent later for the purpose for which it is intended.

Mr. GURUNATHA KRISHNA NADIGAR.—Will the proposals for the special establishment be sanctioned early?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—We shall try.

Another MEMBER.—Because there is no staff at present, will the moneys now kept in suspense be refunded to the concerned panchayat?

Mr. H. B. GUNDAPPA GOWDA.—No. It will be kept by for being spent in future after the establishment is sanctioned.

Reduction of Seat Tax and Renewal of Licences beyond 5-year Limit in the Case of Buses plying over Short Distances.

Q—70. **Mr. G. ABDUL SATTAR** (Hoskote *cum* Devanahalli *cum* Anekal, Mahomedan—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the total number of service buses plying for hire in the State;

(*b*) the number that plies along fixed routes within a distance of 20 miles, between 20 to 40 miles, 40 to 60 miles, 60 to 80 miles, and above 80 miles;

(*c*) the service tax levied per seat;

(*d*) whether it is true that there is a rule that buses plying for hire should be replaced by fresh ones every five years;

(*e*) the principle under which buses plying over long distances and those plying over short distances are condemned simultaneously without distinction?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. V. Narayana Rao).**—

(*a*) 667 inclusive of 7 spare buses and 68 buses plying in Bangalore City.

(*b*) Services plying less than 20 miles ... 77
" Between 20 and 40 miles ... 171
" " 40 and 60 miles ... 168
" " 60 and 80 miles ... 67
" plying above 80 miles ... 109

(*c*) Rs. 7-8-0 on buses plying solely within a municipality, Rs. 7 on I class routes, and Rs. 5-8-0 on II class routes.

(*d*) Under Rule 4-A of the Public Service Motor Vehicles Rules, no permit is to be issued for a bus or lorry more than 5 years old from the date of original registration.

(*e*) The 5-year limit marks the maximum beyond which a vehicle usually becomes unfit to be used. Vehicles plying longer distances and those which are badly maintained are likely to be condemned much earlier during periodical inspections. In special cases where the condition of the vehicle is certified to be good on inspection, its use is being permitted, even after the expiry of 5 years.

Mr. G. ABDUL SATTAR.—That different rates of service tax are charged is noticeable from the answer (*c*). Is this difference in rates based on the distance covered by the buses?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—No.

Mr. G. ABDUL SATTAR.—Then, will it not be unfair if the same rate of service tax per seat is levied on two buses, one of which plies only over short distances while the other covers a long distance, every day?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—The tax levied is with reference to routes, *i.e.*, whether the bus plies over a I class route or a II class route, and not on mileage basis.

Mr. G. ABDUL SATTAR.—Cannot buses be reclassified, for the purpose of the tax, according to the mileage covered each day?

Mr. H. V. NARAYANA RAO.—Seating tax and mileage cess are quite different from each other.